Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2005) 14, 107–131. © 2005 Cambridge University Press
DOI: 10.1017/S0963548304006637 Printed in the United Kingdom

Distance Graphs on the Integers

M. FERRARA,[1] Y. KOHAYAKAWA[2†] and V. RÖDL[1‡]

[1]Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA
(e-mail: {mferrar|rodl}@mathcs.emory.edu)

[2]Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo,
Rua do Matão 1010, 05508–090 São Paulo, Brazil
(e-mail: yoshi@ime.usp.br)

Received 18 June 2003; revised 8 January 2004

Dedicated to the memory of Professor Walter Deuber on the occasion of his 60th birthday

We consider several extremal problems concerning representations of graphs as *distance graphs* on the integers. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, we wish to find an injective function $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{Z}^+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and a set $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\{u, v\} \in E$ if and only if $|\varphi(u) - \varphi(v)| \in \mathscr{D}$.

Let $s(n)$ be the smallest N such that any graph G on n vertices admits a representation $(\varphi_G, \mathscr{D}_G)$ such that $\varphi_G(v) \leqslant N$ for all $v \in V(G)$. We show that $s(n) = (1 + o(1))n^2$ as $n \to \infty$. In fact, if we let $s_r(n)$ be the smallest N such that any r-regular graph G on n vertices admits a representation $(\varphi_G, \mathscr{D}_G)$ such that $\varphi_G(v) \leqslant N$ for all $v \in V(G)$, then $s_r(n) = (1 + o(1))n^2$ as $n \to \infty$ for any $r = r(n) \gg \log n$ with rn even for all n.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, let $D_e(G)$ be the smallest possible cardinality of a set $\mathscr{D}$ for which there is some $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ so that $(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ represents G. We show that, for almost all n-vertex graphs G, we have

$$D_e(G) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2} - (1 + o(1))n^{3/2}(\log n)^{1/2},$$

whereas for some n-vertex graph G, we have

$$D_e(G) \geqslant \binom{n}{2} - n^{3/2}(\log n)^{1/2+o(1)}.$$

Further extremal problems of similar nature are considered.

† Most of this work was done while the second author was visiting the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Emory University, whose support he gratefully acknowledges. The second author is also partially supported by MCT/CNPq (ProNEx Project Proc. CNPq 664107/1997–4) and by CNPq (Proc. 300334/93–1 and 468516/2000–0). The collaboration of the Brazilian author and the US authors is supported by a CNPq/NSF cooperative grant (910064/99–7, 0072064).

‡ The third author was partially supported by NSF Grants 0071261 and DMS 0300529, and an Emory University Research Grant.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. Introduction and statement of the main results

We are interested in representing a graph $G = (V, E)$ by assigning to each vertex $v \in V$ an integer $\varphi(v)$ so that we can then distinguish those pairs of vertices u, v that are edges from those that are not, simply by $|\varphi(u) - \varphi(v)|$. In other words, for each graph $G = (V, E)$ we wish to find a function $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{Z}^+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and a set $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ so that $\{u, v\} \in E$ if and only if $|\varphi(u) - \varphi(v)| \in \mathscr{D}$.

We shall investigate numerical parameters associated with such representations $(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ of G. A basic question is to determine or estimate the smallest possible value for $\max\{\varphi(v) : v \in V(G)\}$ for a given graph G, when we let φ and $\mathscr{D}$ vary freely. We denote this value by $s(G)$ (see (1.5)). Let $s(n) = \max_G s(G)$, where the maximum is taken over all n-vertex graphs. One of our results shows that $s(n) = (1 + o(1))n^2$ (see Theorem 1.3).

We shall also investigate the size of the sets $\mathscr{D}$ that we need, both for individual graphs and when considering all graphs on a fixed number of vertices. Other parameters pertaining to the function φ, which may be of some interest on their own, will also be considered (see Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2).

We are grateful to B. Bollobás and O. Pikhurko for letting us know that problems and results of nature similar to the ones considered here appear in [6] and [17].

Finally, we observe that the subject of this paper may be thought of as a particular case of the problem of representing graphs as induced subgraphs of Cayley graphs (see, *e.g.*, Babai and Sós [2] and the references therein). At least to some extent, this paper shows that the specific case of representing graphs as induced subgraphs of Cayley graphs on the *integers* is already of some interest.

1.1. Definitions

We shall consider integer functions

$$\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+ \tag{1.1}$$

with domain $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. In what follows, the asymptotics will be with respect to $n \to \infty$. A map φ as in (1.1) defines an equivalence relation

$$\sim_\varphi \tag{1.2}$$

on $\binom{[n]}{2}$, the edge set of the complete graph K_n with vertex set $[n]$, given by

$$\{i, j\} \sim_\varphi \{k, \ell\} \iff |\varphi(i) - \varphi(j)| = |\varphi(k) - \varphi(\ell)|. \tag{1.3}$$

Let $\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)$ be the set of equivalence classes of $\sim_\varphi$. Note that

(*) $|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)|$ is the number of distinct 'distances', *i.e.*, integers of the form

$$|\varphi(i) - \varphi(j)| \qquad (i, j \in [n],\ i \neq j), \tag{1.4}$$

that φ induces.

In what follows, we shall be interested in the numerical parameters $\max\{\varphi(i) : i \in [n]\}$ and $|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)|$ of the functions $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$.

We now introduce a central definition.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Definition ($G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$). Given $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, we define the graph $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ as the graph whose vertex set is $[n]$, with i and j adjacent if and only if $|\varphi(i) - \varphi(j)| \in \mathscr{D}$.

If G is isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, then we shall say that $(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ *spaces* G (or that $(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ is a *spacing* of G).

Clearly, in the definition of $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ above, we make i adjacent to j if and only if the distance between $\varphi(i)$ and $\varphi(j)$ is an element of a set $\mathscr{D}$ of 'distinguished' distances. Furthermore, it is clear that the edge set of $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ is a union of equivalence classes of the relation $\sim_\varphi$; equivalently, if $\{i, j\} \sim_\varphi \{k, \ell\}$, then $\{i, j\}$ is an edge of $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ if and only if $\{k, \ell\}$ is.

We are interested in representing graphs G as graphs of the form $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$. In particular, when representing an n-vertex graph G as some $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, numerical constraints on $\mathscr{D}$ and $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) = \{\varphi(i) : i \in [n]\}$ arise. For instance, we shall show that for almost all G, we must allow $|\mathscr{D}|$ to be of order n^2. To prove such constraints, we shall give upper estimates for the number of graphs that are of the form $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, up to isomorphism.

Let us now define some extremal parameters for n-vertex graphs G. In what follows, φ and $\mathscr{D}$ will always stand for a function $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ and a set $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$. (We mention that, in the definitions that follow, we may restrict ourselves to injective functions φ, as G has n vertices and we always wish to have G isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$.)

Given φ, we shall say that a graph G is a *φ-graph* if G is isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ for some $\mathscr{D}$. Similarly, given $\mathscr{D}$, we shall say that G is a *$\mathscr{D}$-graph* if G is isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ for some φ.

Our first extremal parameter is $s(G)$, the minimal integer N for which there is a function φ with $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N]$ such that G is a φ-graph. Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} s(G) &= \min\{N : \text{there is } \varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+ \\ &\qquad \text{such that } \mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N] \text{ and } G \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-graph}\} \\ &= \min\{\max \mathrm{im}(\varphi) : G \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-graph}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

Therefore, $s(G)$ is the 'space' that we need in order to obtain a representation $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ of G. We now define $\mu(G)$ to be the maximal cardinality of an equivalence class of $\sim_\varphi$, where we let φ vary among all functions such that G is a φ-graph:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(G) = \max\{|C| : C \text{ is an equivalence class of } \sim_\varphi, \\ \text{where } \varphi \text{ is such that } G \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-graph}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

Thus, $\mu(G)$ is the maximum 'multiplicity' with which a 'distance' (recall (*)) may occur in a representation $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ of G.

Our third and fourth parameters concern the *number* of 'distances' that we use in our representations of G. We let

$$D(G) = \min\{|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| : G \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-graph}\}. \tag{1.7}$$

Hence, $D(G)$ is the minimal possible number of 'distances' that are induced by the $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ in the representations $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ of G. We may also restrict ourselves to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

counting distinct 'distances' that occur as *edges* in our representations of G. We let

$$D_{\mathrm{e}}(G) = \min\{|\mathscr{D}| : G \text{ is a } \mathscr{D}\text{-graph}\}. \tag{1.8}$$

Thus, $D_{\mathrm{e}}(G)$ is the minimum number of 'edge lengths' that are required in the representations $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ of G.

It is easy to see that $s(K_n) = s(C_n) = s(P_n) = n$, where, as usual, C_n is the cycle on n vertices and P_n is the path on n vertices. However, calculating the spacing number of a graph exactly can be delicate, even for very simple graphs. As usual, $K_{m,n}$ denotes the complete bipartite graph with vertex classes of cardinality m and n.

Proposition 1.1. *For $m \geqslant n$, we have*

$$s(K_{m,n}) = \begin{cases} 2m & \text{if } m = n, \\ 2m-1 & \text{if } m > n. \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

In order to prove the proposition, we must first prove the following.

Proposition 1.2. *For any $n > 1$, we have $s(K_{1,n}) = 2n - 1$.*

To see that $s(K_{1,n}) \leqslant 2n-1$ consider $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, where

$$\mathrm{im}(\varphi) = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, \ldots, 2n-1\} \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$\mathscr{D} = \{1, 3, 5, \ldots, 2n-3\}. \tag{1.11}$$

Then $(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ spaces $K_{1,n}$, and hence $s(K_{1,n}) \leqslant 2n-1$. The reverse inequality will be proved in Section 2. Proposition 1.1 follows by monotonicity under taking induced subgraphs.

Another example that seems to show that the problem of determining or estimating $s(G)$ does require some idea is the case in which G is a tree. The authors have not come across any general, nontrivial bounds for this case (see Section 6 below and [2, Remark 7.2]). Let us now get back to the general case.

Let

$$s(n) = \max_G s(G), \quad \mu(n) = \min_G \mu(G), \quad D(n) = \max_G D(G), \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$D_{\mathrm{e}}(n) = \max_G D_{\mathrm{e}}(G), \tag{1.13}$$

where the maxima are taken over all n-vertex graphs G. For positive integers r, we also let

$$s_r(n) = \max_G s(G), \tag{1.14}$$

where the maximum is taken over all r-regular graphs G on n vertices. Our main concern in this note is to give estimates for the extremal functions $s(n)$, $s_r(n)$, $\mu(n)$, $D(n)$, and $D_{\mathrm{e}}(n)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.2. Statement of the results

The following are our results pertaining to the parameters given above. The proofs will be given in Sections 4 and 5.

We start with the extremal functions $s(n)$ and $s_r(n)$.

Theorem 1.3. *We have*

$$n^2\left(1-(4+o(1))\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right) \leqslant s(n) \leqslant n^2 + O\left(n^{1.525}\right). \tag{1.15}$$

Theorem 1.4.

(i) *For every fixed integer $r \geqslant 2$ and for all n with rn even, we have*

$$s_r(n) \geqslant (1+o(1))\left(\frac{1}{r!}\right)^{2/(r+2)}\left(\frac{r}{\mathrm{e}\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2r/(r+2)} n^{2r/(r+2)}. \tag{1.16}$$

(ii) *Let $r = r(n)$ be an integer function satisfying $\log n \ll r \leqslant (n-1)/2$ and with rn even for all n. Then*

$$s_r(n) = (1+o(1))n^2. \tag{1.17}$$

Our result concerning the 'multiplicity' parameter $\mu(n)$ is as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *For all sufficiently large n, we have*

$$\mu(n) < 2 + 8\log_2 n. \tag{1.18}$$

The next three results deal with the functions $D(n)$ and $D_{\mathrm{e}}(n)$ and the parameter $D_{\mathrm{e}}(G)$, concerning the number of distinct distances that are involved in our representations of graphs.

Theorem 1.6. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that if $n \geqslant n_0$, then*

$$D(n) > \binom{n}{2} - 4n\log_2 n + 2n - \frac{1}{2}\log_2(2\pi n) - \varepsilon. \tag{1.19}$$

Theorem 1.7. *For almost all n-vertex graphs G, we have*

$$D_{\mathrm{e}}(G) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2} - (1+o(1))n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}. \tag{1.20}$$

Theorem 1.8. *For any function $\omega = \omega(n)$ such that $\omega(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, we have*

$$D_{\mathrm{e}}(n) \geqslant \binom{n}{2} - 3\omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} - 3 \tag{1.21}$$

for all large enough n.

Finally, we observe that there are n-vertex graphs G for which we have both $D_{\mathrm{e}}(G) = (1+o(1))\binom{n}{2}$ and $s(G) = (1+o(1))n^2$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Corollary 1.9. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed and suppose $\omega = \omega(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then, for all large enough n, there is an n-vertex graph G for which we have*

$$D_e(G) \geqslant \binom{n}{2} - 3\omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} - 3 \tag{1.22}$$

and

$$s(G) \geqslant \left(1 - (2\sqrt{6} + \varepsilon)\omega^{1/2}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/4}\right)n^2. \tag{1.23}$$

2. Proof of Proposition 1.2

We have already observed that $s(K_{1,n}) \leqslant 2n - 1$. To establish the reverse inequality, we need the following claim.

Claim 2.1. *If $K_{1,n}$ is isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, where* $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [2n-1]$, *then the root vertex is associated with neither* 1 *nor* $\max \mathrm{im}(\varphi)$.

Proof. Assume otherwise; specifically, assume that the root vertex of $K_{1,n}$ is associated with 1. Then there are n distinct differences in $\mathscr{D}$ corresponding to the edges in the graph. However, since 1 is associated with the vertex of degree n in our graph, the largest value, namely $\max \mathrm{im}(\varphi)$, must be associated with a leaf v. Hence there are $n-1$ distinct values not in $\mathscr{D}$ corresponding to the non-edges between v and the other leaves. However, this implies that $2n - 2 = |\mathscr{D}| + |[2n-2] \setminus \mathscr{D}| \geqslant n + n - 1 = 2n - 1$, a contradiction. □

We can now prove the proposition.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. We proceed by induction on n, and note that the claim is easily shown true when $n = 2$ or $n = 3$. Let $(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ be a spacing of $K_{1,n}$ $(n > 3)$ that realizes the spacing number and assume that $\max \mathrm{im}(\varphi) = s(K_{1,n})$ is at most $2n - 2$. If x is the vertex of degree n in the graph, then the claim tells us that x is not associated with 1 or $s(K_{1,n})$. Therefore, both 1 and $s(K_{1,n})$ must be leaves. Note that both 2 and $s(K_{1,n}) - 1$ must also be in $\mathrm{im}(\varphi)$ and associated with leaves, lest $s(K_{1,n-1}) \leqslant 2n - 4$ (contradicting the induction assumption), or one of these points is associated with x, contradicting the claim. Now, assume that x is associated with some point p_i in $\mathrm{im}(\varphi)$. By the above, $p_i \notin \{1, 2, s(K_{1,n}) - 1,\ s(K_{1,n})\}$. Assume that there are $l \geqslant 2$ points associated with leaves in the interval $[1, p_i]$ and $n - l$ points associated with leaves in the interval $[p_i, s(K_{1,n})]$. Then the points from $\mathrm{im}(\varphi)$ in these intervals along with $\mathscr{D}$ comprise spacings of $K_{1,l}$ and $K_{1,n-l}$ respectively. Also, the root vertex of these stars are associated with the largest and smallest values in these intervals. In order to space $K_{1,l}$ in this way, the claim implies $p_i \geqslant 2l$. However, we then have $s(K_{1,n-l}) \leqslant s(K_{1,n}) - p_i \leqslant 2n - 2 - 2l = 2(n-l) - 2$, contradicting the induction assumption. □

As noted above, this also completes the proof of Proposition 1.1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. Auxiliary lemmas

In this section, we give two elementary results from combinatorial number theory.

3.1. Almost Sidon sets

To establish our bounds on $s(n)$, we shall make use of a classical object from combinatorial number theory. A set

$$A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \tag{3.1}$$

is called a *Sidon set* if

$$|\{|a_i - a_j| : i < j\}| = \binom{n}{2}, \tag{3.2}$$

that is, if all of the differences of distinct elements are distinct. It was shown by Erdős and Turán in [9] that if $A \subset [N]$ is an n-element Sidon set, then

$$N \geqslant n^2 + O(n^{3/2}) \tag{3.3}$$

(see also [13, 14]). We shall examine a similar type of set, wherein the pairwise differences are almost all distinct. Lemma 3.1 below, in a slightly different form, appears as Theorem 1 in [6]. The proofs of Lemma 3.1 and [6, Theorem 1] follow [9] closely, and were obtained independently.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $0 < \varepsilon = \varepsilon(n) \leqslant 1$ be such that $\varepsilon n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Suppose $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ is an injective function such that*

$$|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| \geqslant (1 - \varepsilon)\binom{n}{2} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N]. \tag{3.5}$$

Then

$$N \geqslant \big(1 - (2 + o(1))\sqrt{\varepsilon}\big)n^2. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. As mentioned above, we follow [9] very closely. Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n)$ and $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ be as in the statement of our lemma. Let $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) = \{x_i : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$, where

$$x_1 < \cdots < x_n. \tag{3.7}$$

Let $m = \lfloor \varepsilon^{1/2} n^2 \rfloor$. Let us consider the following $N + m$ intervals of integers, each of cardinality m:

$$I_1 = [-m + 1, 1), I_2 = [-m + 2, 2), \ldots, I_{N+m} = [N, N + m). \tag{3.8}$$

Let B_k be the number of x_i that belong to the interval $I_k = [-m + k, k)$. Let us count the triples $(x_i, x_j; I_k)$ for which we have $x_i < x_j$ and $x_i, x_j \in I_k$. Let T be the number of such triples.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We have

$$T = \sum_{1 \leqslant k \leqslant N+m} \binom{B_k}{2} \geqslant \frac{1}{2}(N+m)\frac{nm}{N+m}\left(\frac{nm}{N+m} - 1\right), \tag{3.9}$$

where the inequality follows from convexity. Let us now estimate T in an alternative way.

Pick $L \geqslant (1-\varepsilon)\binom{n}{2}$ pairs $(x_{i_\lambda}, x_{j_\lambda})$ $(1 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant L)$ with $x_{i_\lambda} < x_{j_\lambda}$ for all λ and all the differences

$$d_\lambda = x_{j_\lambda} - x_{i_\lambda} \qquad (1 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant L) \tag{3.10}$$

distinct. Fix a pair $(x_{i_\lambda}, x_{j_\lambda})$. If $d_\lambda = x_{j_\lambda} - x_{i_\lambda} \geqslant m$, then clearly there is no k for which both x_{i_λ} and $x_{j_\lambda} \in I_k$. If $d_\lambda < m$, then there are $m - d_\lambda$ intervals I_k with both x_{i_λ} and $x_{j_\lambda} \in I_k$. Given that all the differences in these L pairs are distinct, we deduce that the number of triples of the form $(x_{i_\lambda}, x_{j_\lambda}; I_k)$ $(1 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant L)$ that we are interested in is

$$\leqslant \sum_{1 \leqslant d < m} (m-d) = \binom{m}{2}. \tag{3.11}$$

Now we have to take into account the triples $(x_i, x_j; I_k)$ for the pairs (x_i, x_j) that are not one of the $(x_{i_\lambda}, x_{j_\lambda})$ $(1 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant L)$. We use a crude bound for such pairs, of which there are at most $\varepsilon\binom{n}{2}$: each of the pairs occur in at most $m-1$ intervals I_k each. Therefore, we have

$$T \leqslant \binom{m}{2} + \varepsilon\binom{n}{2}(m-1) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(m^2 + \varepsilon n^2 m\right). \tag{3.12}$$

Comparing (3.9) and (3.12), we have

$$n\left(\frac{nm}{N+m} - 1\right) \leqslant m + \varepsilon n^2, \tag{3.13}$$

which is equivalent to

$$n^2 m \leqslant (N+m)(m + \varepsilon n^2 + n). \tag{3.14}$$

Since $\varepsilon n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, we deduce from (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} N \geqslant \frac{n^2 m}{m + (1+o(1))\varepsilon n^2} - m &\geqslant n^2 \frac{1}{1 + (1+o(1))\varepsilon n^2/m} - \varepsilon^{1/2} n^2 \\ &\geqslant n^2\left(1 - (1+o(1))\varepsilon^{1/2}\right) - \varepsilon^{1/2} n^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

and (3.6) follows. □

3.2. The number of equivalence relations $\sim_\varphi$

Recall that each $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ defines an equivalence relation $\sim_\varphi$ on $\binom{[n]}{2}$ (see (1.3)). Let

$$T(n) = |\{\sim_\varphi : \varphi \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^{[n]}\}|. \tag{3.16}$$

The upper bound for $T(n)$ given in Lemma 3.2 below will be crucial when estimating $D(n)$ and $D_e(n)$. The reader may find it interesting to observe how small $T(n)$ is, in comparison

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the total number of equivalence relations on $\binom{[n]}{2}$, which is given by the Bell number

$$b_{\binom{n}{2}} = \binom{n}{2}^{(1+o(1))\binom{n}{2}} = n^{(1+o(1))n^2} \tag{3.17}$$

(see, *e.g.*, [11]).

Lemma 3.2. *For all $n \geqslant 3$, we have*

$$T(n) \leqslant \binom{2\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{2}}{n} \leqslant (1+o(1))\left(\frac{en^3}{4}\right)^n. \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. Let $\varphi_\lambda : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ ($\lambda \in \Lambda$) be $T(n)$ maps with all the $\sim_{\varphi_\lambda}$ distinct. Moreover, let p be a sufficiently large prime; any choice with

$$p > \max_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\big(\max \operatorname{im}(\varphi_\lambda)\big)^2 \tag{3.19}$$

will do. We may consider the maps φ_λ as maps into $\mathbb{F}_p$, the field of order p, in the obvious way:

$$\varphi_\lambda : [n] \to \mathbb{F}_p. \tag{3.20}$$

For convenience, let

$$x_{\lambda,i} = \varphi_\lambda(i) \quad (\lambda \in \Lambda,\ i \in [n]) \tag{3.21}$$

and let

$$\mathbf{x}_\lambda = (x_{\lambda,i})_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}. \tag{3.22}$$

Let

$$\mathscr{R} = \binom{\binom{[n]}{2}}{2} = \binom{E(K^n)}{2}, \tag{3.23}$$

and consider the quadratic polynomials

$$f_\varrho(x_1,\dots,x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x_1,\dots,x_n] \qquad (\varrho \in \mathscr{R}), \tag{3.24}$$

where, if $\varrho = \{\{i,j\},\{k,\ell\}\} \in \mathscr{R}$, then

$$f_\varrho(x_1,\dots,x_n) = (x_i - x_j)^2 - (x_k - x_\ell)^2. \tag{3.25}$$

We let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1,\dots,x_n)$ and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = (f_\varrho(\mathbf{x}))_{\varrho\in\mathscr{R}}$.

Given $\mathbf{z} = (z_\varrho)_{\varrho\in\mathscr{R}} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\mathscr{R}}$, let the *zero pattern* $Z(\mathbf{z})$ of $\mathbf{z}$ be the $\{0,*\}$-vector $(s_\varrho)_{\varrho\in\mathscr{R}}$, where

$$s_\varrho = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } z_\varrho = 0, \\ * & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We now consider the zero patterns $Z(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*))$ of the vectors $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)$, where we let $\mathbf{x}^*$ vary in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. Theorem 1.3 in [18] tells us that

$$|\{Z(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*)) : \mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\}| \leqslant \binom{2|\mathscr{R}|}{n} = \binom{2\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{2}}{n} \leqslant \binom{n^4/4}{n} \leqslant (1+o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}n^3}{4}\right)^n. \tag{3.27}$$

It now suffices to relate zero patterns with the equivalence relations $\sim_{\varphi_\lambda}$. Recall (1.3), (3.19), (3.21), and (3.22), and observe that, for any $\sim_{\varphi_\lambda}$ and any $\varrho = \{\{i,j\},\{k,\ell\}\} \in \mathscr{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\{i,j\} \sim_{\varphi_\lambda} \{k,\ell\} &\iff |\varphi_\lambda(i) - \varphi_\lambda(j)| = |\varphi_\lambda(k) - \varphi_\lambda(\ell)| \\ &\iff (x_{\lambda,i} - x_{\lambda,j})^2 = (x_{\lambda,k} - x_{\lambda,\ell})^2 \iff \mathbf{f}_\varrho(\mathbf{x}_\lambda) = 0 \ \text{ in } \mathbb{F}_p.\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

(Note that the 'if' part of the last 'if and only if' follows from (3.19).) By the definition of zero patterns, the equivalences in (3.28) tell us that the relations $\sim_{\varphi_\lambda}$ and $\sim_{\varphi_{\lambda'}}$ coincide if and only if $Z(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_\lambda)) = Z(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda'}))$. This fact and (3.27) imply (3.18), and Lemma 3.2 is proved. □

4. Proofs of Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5

In this section we shall prove our results concerning the extremal functions $s(n)$, $s_r(n)$, and $\mu(n)$.

4.1. Proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4

We start with the spacing parameters $s(n)$ and $s_r(n)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We shall show that

$$\left(1 - (4+o(1))\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)n^2 \leqslant s(n) \leqslant n^2 + O(n^{1.525}). \tag{4.1}$$

We prove the upper bound using Sidon sets. Let G be a graph with vertex set $\{v_1,\dots,v_n\}$ and let $A = \{a_1,\dots,a_n\}$ be a Sidon set. Then $(\varphi,\mathscr{D})$ spaces G, where $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ is any function such that $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) = A$ and

$$\mathscr{D} = \{|a_i - a_j| : \{v_i,v_j\} \in E(G)\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Thus, in order to estimate $s(n)$ from above, we wish to minimize the maximum element in an n-element Sidon set. The following is a well-known consequence of a result of Singer [20] (for details, see [12, Chapter II]).

Lemma 4.1. *Let q be a prime power. Then there is a $(q+1)$-element Sidon set $A = \{a_0,a_1,\dots,a_q\}$ with $1 \leqslant a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_q \leqslant q^2+q+1$.*

It was shown by Baker, Harman, and Pintz [3] that, for any sufficiently large n, there is always a prime q in the interval $[n-1, n+(1+o(1))n^{0.525}]$. Putting together the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

observations above, we have

$$s(n) \leqslant \left(n + (1+o(1))n^{0.525}\right)^2 + \left(n + (1+o(1))n^{0.525}\right) + 1 = n^2 + O(n^{1.525}), \tag{4.3}$$

and the upper bound in (4.1) follows. We now turn to the lower bound on $s(n)$.

Let δ be a fixed positive real, and let

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n) = \frac{4\log n}{n-1}. \tag{4.4}$$

Suppose for a contradiction that

$$s(n) \leqslant N_0 = \left\lfloor n^2\left(1 - (4+\delta)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)\right\rfloor. \tag{4.5}$$

Let us invoke Lemma 3.1, with ε given in (4.4). Lemma 3.1 tells us that if $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ is such that

$$|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| \geqslant (1-\varepsilon)\binom{n}{2} \tag{4.6}$$

and $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N]$, then

$$N \geqslant n^2\left(1 - (2+o(1))\sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) = n^2\left(1 - (4+o(1))\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right). \tag{4.7}$$

Comparing (4.5) and (4.7), we see that, for all $n \geqslant n_0(\delta)$, the $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ that are such that $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N_0]$ must all be such that (4.6) fails, that is,

$$|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| < (1-\varepsilon)\binom{n}{2}. \tag{4.8}$$

Note that (4.5) tells us that if we consider the graphs $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ with $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N_0]$ and $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ arbitrary, then we obtain all n-vertex graphs up to isomorphism.

Remark (1) (page 122) and (4.8), coupled with the fact that there are at least $2^{\binom{n}{2}}/n!$ graphs on n vertices up to isomorphism, tell us that

$$\frac{N_0^n}{n!}2^{(1-\varepsilon)\binom{n}{2}} \geqslant \binom{N_0}{n}2^{(1-\varepsilon)\binom{n}{2}} \geqslant \frac{1}{n!}2^{\binom{n}{2}}. \tag{4.9}$$

Inequalities (4.4) and (4.9) give that $N_0 \geqslant n^2$, which contradicts (4.5) for all $n \geqslant n_0(\delta)$. This contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.3. The following estimates for the number of r-regular graphs will be used now. We first quote a classical result of Bender and Canfield [4] (see also [5, Corollary 2.17]), in the case in which r is a fixed integer.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 4.2. *For any fixed integer $r \geqslant 2$, the number $R(n,r)$ of labelled, n-vertex r-regular graphs satisfies*

$$R(n,r) \geqslant (\sqrt{2}+o(1))\mathrm{e}^{-(r^2-1)/4}\left(\frac{r^{r/2}}{\mathrm{e}^{r/2}r!}\right)^n n^{rn/2} \tag{4.10}$$

as $n \to \infty$ with rn even.

For recent results concerning the number of r-regular graphs with $r = r(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, see McKay and Wormald [15], where Theorem 4.2 is extended to $r = o(\sqrt{n})$. For a wider range of r, we shall make use of the following fact, which may be deduced from the well-known theorems of Egorychev and Falikman [8, 10] and Brégman [7]. (A result stronger than Fact 4.3 may be proved with the same method; here, we only state a result that is enough for our purposes.)

Fact 4.3. *If $r = r(n)$ satisfies $\log n \ll r \leqslant n/2$ and rn is even for all n, then the number $R(n,r)$ of labelled, r-regular graphs on n vertices satisfies*

$$R(n,r) \geqslant \binom{\binom{n}{2}}{rn/2}(1-o(1))^{rn}. \tag{4.11}$$

Note that Fact 4.3 implies that the number of r-regular graphs on n vertices is the same as the number of graphs with n vertices and $rn/2$ edges, up to a factor of the form $\exp\{-o(rn)\}$. We shall only give a brief sketch of the proof of Fact 4.3 here. (For an alternative proof, the reader is referred to Shamir and Upfal [19].)

Proof of Fact 4.3 (sketch). For simplicity, we suppose that n and r are both even. First we examine the number $\mathrm{Bip}(n/2,r/2)$ of $r/2$-regular spanning subgraphs of $K_{n/2,n/2}$. In a standard way, using the theorems of Egorychev [8] and Falikman [10] that give a lower bound for the number of perfect matchings in regular bipartite graphs (van der Waerden's conjecture) and a result of Brégman [7] that gives an upper bound for such a number (Minc's conjecture), one may show that

$$\mathrm{Bip}(n/2,r/2) \geqslant \binom{n/2}{r/2}^{n/2}(1-o(1))^{rn}. \tag{4.12}$$

Next, one observes that

$$R(n,r) \geqslant \prod_{j\geqslant 1}\left[\mathrm{Bip}\left(\frac{n}{2^j},\frac{r}{2^j}\right)\right]^{2^{j-1}} \tag{4.13}$$

(for simplicity, divisibility conditions are ignored in (4.13)). One may derive (4.11) from (4.12) and (4.13). □

We may now prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We first prove (i). Note that if $r = 2$, then the claimed bound (1.16) is trivial. Fix an integer $r \geqslant 3$. In what follows, rn is supposed to be even.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let N be a positive integer. The number of graphs that are of the form $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ with $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ and with $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\mathrm{im}(\varphi) \subset [N]$ is

$$\leqslant \binom{N}{n} \sum_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant rn/2} \binom{N-1}{j}, \tag{4.14}$$

as we have $\binom{N}{n}$ choices for $\mathrm{im}(\varphi)$ and we may suppose $\mathscr{D} \subset [N-1]$.

Now suppose that $s_r(n) \leqslant N$. Then the quantity in (4.10) divided by $n!$ has to be at most the quantity in (4.14). This gives that

$$(\sqrt{2} + o(1))\mathrm{e}^{-(r^2-1)/4}\left(\frac{r^{r/2}}{\mathrm{e}^{r/2} r!}\right)^n \frac{n^{rn/2}}{n!} \leqslant \binom{N}{n} \sum_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant rn/2} \binom{N-1}{j}. \tag{4.15}$$

Let us now show that $N \geqslant rn$. Suppose for a contradiction that $N < rn$. In this case, we get from (4.15) that

$$(\sqrt{2} + o(1))\mathrm{e}^{-(r^2-1)/4}\left(\frac{r^{r/2}}{\mathrm{e}^{r/2} r!}\right)^n \frac{n^{rn/2}}{n!} \leqslant \binom{rn}{n} 2^{rn}. \tag{4.16}$$

Taking the nth root, we obtain from (4.16) that

$$\frac{r^{r/2}}{e^{r/2} r!} n^{r/2} \leqslant rn 2^r, \tag{4.17}$$

which is clearly false for $n \geqslant n_0(r)$ because $r \geqslant 3$. This contradiction shows that we do have $N \geqslant rn$.

It follows from $N \geqslant rn$ that the quantity in (4.14) is

$$\leqslant \frac{1}{2} rn \binom{N}{n} \binom{N}{rn/2}. \tag{4.18}$$

From (4.15), we have

$$(\sqrt{2} + o(1))\mathrm{e}^{-(r^2-1)/4}\left(\frac{r^{r/2}}{\mathrm{e}^{r/2} r!}\right)^n \frac{n^{rn/2}}{n!} \leqslant \frac{1}{2} rn \binom{N}{n} \binom{N}{rn/2}. \tag{4.19}$$

Taking the nth root, we obtain

$$(1 + o(1))\frac{r^{r/2}}{\mathrm{e}^{r/2} r!} \mathrm{e} n^{r/2-1} \leqslant \frac{\mathrm{e}N}{n}\left(\frac{2\mathrm{e}N}{rn}\right)^{r/2}, \tag{4.20}$$

whence

$$(1 + o(1))\frac{r^r}{2^{r/2}\mathrm{e}^r r!} n^r \leqslant N^{(r+2)/2}. \tag{4.21}$$

Therefore

$$N \geqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{1}{r!}\right)^{2/(r+2)} \left(\frac{r}{\mathrm{e}\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2r/(r+2)} n^{2r/(r+2)}, \tag{4.22}$$

and (1.16) follows. This completes the proof of (i).

Let us now turn to the proof of (ii). Let $r = r(n)$ as in the statement of the theorem be given. Clearly, it follows from the upper bound in (1.15) that $s_r(n) \leqslant (1 + o(1))n^2$. We need to prove the reverse inequality.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Assume that, for some fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$s_r(n) \leqslant (1-\varepsilon)n^2 \text{ for arbitrarily large } n. \tag{4.23}$$

We shall derive a contradiction from this assumption, and this will complete the proof of (1.17).

Lemma 3.1 tells us that if $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ is such that

$$\operatorname{im}\varphi \subset [(1-\varepsilon)n^2], \tag{4.24}$$

then there exists some $\sigma > 0$ for which we have

$$|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| < (1-\sigma)\binom{n}{2}. \tag{4.25}$$

Thus, the total number of φ-graphs with φ satisfying (4.24) is, up to isomorphism, at most

$$\binom{n^2}{n} \sum_{j \leqslant rn/2} \binom{(1-\sigma)\binom{n}{2}}{j}. \tag{4.26}$$

We shall now compare (4.11) and (4.26). It will be convenient to consider separately two ranges for r.

Case 1. $r \leqslant (1-\sigma)(n-1)/2$.

In this case, we bound the quantity in (4.26) from above by

$$\binom{n^2}{n} \frac{rn}{2} \binom{(1-\sigma)\binom{n}{2}}{rn/2}. \tag{4.27}$$

Using that $r \gg \log n$, we see that the quantity in (4.27) is smaller than (4.11) for $n \geqslant n_0(\sigma)$. This contradicts (4.23), completing the proof in this case.

Case 2. $(1-\sigma)(n-1)/2 < r \leqslant (n-1)/2$.

In this case, we bound the quantity in (4.26) from above by

$$2^{(1-\sigma)\binom{n}{2}}(1+o(1))^{n^2}. \tag{4.28}$$

However, examining (4.11), one sees that in this case the number of r-regular graphs is at least

$$\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{\lfloor((1-\sigma)/2)\binom{n}{2}\rfloor}(1-o(1))^{n^2}. \tag{4.29}$$

We shall estimate (4.29) using the following well-known fact, which is a consequence of Stirling's formula.

Fact 4.4. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be fixed and let m be a positive integer. Then*

$$\binom{m}{\lfloor \alpha m \rfloor} = \left[\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\alpha}\right]^m (1+o(1))^m, \tag{4.30}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Applying Fact 4.4 to (4.29), we have that the number of r-regular graphs is at least

$$\left[\left(\frac{2}{1-\sigma}\right)^{(1-\sigma)/2}\left(\frac{2}{(1+\sigma)}\right)^{(1+\sigma)/2}\right]^{\binom{n}{2}}(1-o(1))^{n^2}. \tag{4.31}$$

As in the first case, assumption (4.23) tells us that the quantity in (4.28) should be at least as large as the quantity in (4.31), that is,

$$\left[\left(\frac{2}{1-\sigma}\right)^{(1-\sigma)/2}\left(\frac{2}{(1+\sigma)}\right)^{(1+\sigma)/2}\right]^{\binom{n}{2}} \leqslant 2^{(1-\sigma)\binom{n}{2}}(1+o(1))^{n^2}. \tag{4.32}$$

We shall now see that (4.32) does not hold if $n \geqslant n_0(\sigma)$.

Keeping in mind that $\sigma > 0$ is a constant and n tends to infinity, inequality (4.32) simplifies to

$$\left(\frac{1-\sigma}{2}\right)\log_2\frac{2}{1-\sigma} + \left(\frac{1+\sigma}{2}\right)\log_2\frac{2}{1+\sigma} \leqslant 1-\sigma. \tag{4.33}$$

Equivalently,

$$\left(\frac{1-\sigma}{2}\right)\big(1-\log_2(1-\sigma)\big) + \left(\frac{1+\sigma}{2}\right)\big(1-\log_2(1+\sigma)\big) \leqslant 1-\sigma; \tag{4.34}$$

that is,

$$(1-\sigma)\log_2(1-\sigma) + (1+\sigma)\log_2(1+\sigma) - 2\sigma \geqslant 0. \tag{4.35}$$

Let

$$f(\sigma) = (1-\sigma)\log_2(1-\sigma) + (1+\sigma)\log_2(1+\sigma) - 2\sigma. \tag{4.36}$$

Note that $f(0) = 0$ and

$$f'(\sigma) = \log_2\left(\frac{1+\sigma}{1-\sigma}\right) - 2 < 0. \tag{4.37}$$

This implies that f is decreasing for $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Hence, for any small $\sigma > 0$, the inequalities given in (4.32)–(4.35) fail for $n \geqslant n_0(\sigma)$. Thus, as in Case 1, assumption (4.23) cannot hold. This completes the proof of Case 2, and hence (ii) of Theorem 1.4 is proved. □

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.5

We now consider the 'multiplicity' parameter $\mu(n)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We wish to show that there exists a graph G such that for any $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that G is a φ-graph, no element of $\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)$ has cardinality $2 + 8\log_2 n$ or more.

Suppose $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ is an injective function such that $\sim_\varphi$ has an equivalence class $C \subset \binom{[n]}{2}$ of cardinality $\mu \geqslant 2 + 8\log_2 n$. It is clear that C spans a disjoint union of paths on $[n]$. Therefore, there is a matching $M \subset C$ with $|M| \geqslant |C|/2$. Let $v = |M| \geqslant 1 + 4\log_2 n$. Considering this matching, one sees that there are $2v$ distinct integers

$$x_1 < y_1, x_2 < y_2, \ldots, x_v < y_v \tag{4.38}$$

in $\mathrm{im}(\varphi)$ with all the differences $y_i - x_i$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant v)$ equal.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clearly, by the definition of $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, regardless of $\mathscr{D}$, the subgraphs of $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ induced by the x_i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant v)$ and the y_i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant v)$ are isomorphic. To prove our theorem, namely, to verify (1.18), it suffices to prove the following fact.

Fact 4.5. *For all large enough n, there is an n-vertex graph G that does not contain two vertex-disjoint, isomorphic induced subgraphs of order $v \geqslant 1 + 4\log_2 n$.*

Proof. Consider the binomial random graph $G = G(n,p)$ with $p = 1/2$, and let $v = v(n) \geqslant 1 + 4\log_2 n$ be given. Let $X_v = X_v(G)$ be the number of pairs (H, H') of induced subgraphs of G of order v with H isomorphic to H'. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(X_v > 0) \leqslant \mathbb{E}(X_v) < n^{2v} 2^{-\binom{v}{2}} = \left(n^2 2^{-(v-1)/2}\right)^v \leqslant 1, \tag{4.39}$$

and therefore a graph as required does exist. □

As observed above, Fact 4.5 concludes the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

5. Proofs of Theorems 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8

Let us now prove our results concerning the number of distances in our representations of graphs. Before we proceed, we make the following remark on the number of graphs that may be 'generated' from a given φ.

Remarks. **(1)** Fix $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then

$$|\{G(\varphi, \mathscr{D}) : \mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+\}| \leqslant 2^{|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)|}. \tag{5.1}$$

(2) Fix $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ and let D be an integer. Then

$$|\{G(\varphi, \mathscr{D}) : |\mathscr{D}| \leqslant D\}| \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{D} \binom{|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)|}{j} \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{D} \binom{\binom{n}{2}}{j}. \tag{5.2}$$

5.1. Proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7

We start with our result concerning $D(n)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We wish to show that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $n \geqslant n_0(\varepsilon)$, there exists a graph G on n vertices such that whenever G is a φ-graph we have

$$|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| > \binom{n}{2} - 4n\log_2 n + 2n - \frac{1}{2}\log_2(2\pi n) - \varepsilon.$$

Let $D = \binom{n}{2} - 4n\log_2 n + 2n - (1/2)\log_2(2\pi n) - \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrary fixed constant, and suppose for a contradiction that $D(n) \leqslant D$. Note that if $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ is such that $|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| \leqslant D$, then, by Remark (1), we have

$$|\{G(\varphi, \mathscr{D}) : \mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+\}| \leqslant 2^{|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)|} \leqslant \frac{1}{2^\varepsilon \sqrt{2\pi n}} 2^{\binom{n}{2}} n^{-4n} 4^n. \tag{5.3}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By Lemma 3.2, as we let $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ vary, we have

$$T(n) \leqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}n^3}{4}\right)^n \tag{5.4}$$

distinct $\sim_\varphi$. By (5.3) and (5.4), if we only consider $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| \leqslant D$, we are able to produce

$$\leqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}n^3}{4}\right)^n \left(\frac{4}{n^4}\right)^n \frac{2^{\binom{n}{2}}}{2^\varepsilon\sqrt{2\pi n}} = (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}}{n}\right)^n \frac{2^{\binom{n}{2}}}{2^\varepsilon\sqrt{2\pi n}} \tag{5.5}$$

non-isomorphic graphs. On the other hand, using Stirling's formula

$$n! = (1 + o(1))(n/\mathrm{e})^n\sqrt{2\pi n},$$

we see that there are

$$\geqslant \frac{1}{n!}2^{\binom{n}{2}} \geqslant \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{2\pi n}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}}{n}\right)^n 2^{\binom{n}{2}} \tag{5.6}$$

graphs on n vertices up to isomorphism. According to our assumption that $D(n) \leqslant D$, the quantity in (5.5) must be at least the quantity in (5.6), which is not the case for $n \geqslant n_0(\varepsilon)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.6. □

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We shall prove that for almost all graphs G on n vertices, if G is a $\mathscr{D}$-graph, then

$$|\mathscr{D}| \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2} - (1 + o(1))n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}. \tag{5.7}$$

The proof of this result follows the same steps as the proof of Theorem 1.6, except that we shall make use of Remark (2) instead of Remark (1).

For any given k, let us consider all $\mathscr{D}$-graphs for all $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$|\mathscr{D}| \leqslant D = \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2} - k. \tag{5.8}$$

By Remark (2) and Lemma 3.2, the number of such graphs is, up to isomorphism,

$$\begin{aligned} &\leqslant T(n)\sum_{j=0}^{D}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{j} \leqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}n^3}{4}\right)^n \sum_{j=0}^{D}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{j} \\ &\qquad \leqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}n^3}{4}\right)^n 2^{\binom{n}{2}} \exp\left\{-2k^2\binom{n}{2}^{-1}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where in the last inequality we used that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\lceil N/2 - a\rceil}\binom{N}{j} \leqslant 2^N \mathrm{e}^{-2a^2/N} \tag{5.10}$$

for all integers $N \geqslant 1$ and all real a (see, *e.g.*, [1, Theorem A.1]). From (5.9), we see that if, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, an ε-fraction of the graphs on n vertices are such that $D_{\mathrm{e}}(G) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2} - k$,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

then we must have

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2\pi n}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}}{n}\right)^n 2^{\binom{n}{2}} \leqslant (1+o(1))\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}n^3}{4}\right)^n 2^{\binom{n}{2}} \exp\left\{-2k^2\binom{n}{2}^{-1}\right\}, \tag{5.11}$$

which tells us that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2\pi n}}\left(\frac{4}{n^4}\right)^n \leqslant (1+o(1))\exp\left\{-2k^2\binom{n}{2}^{-1}\right\}. \tag{5.12}$$

Therefore, for large enough n, we have, say,

$$\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\pi n}\left(\frac{n^4}{4}\right)^n \geqslant \exp\left\{2k^2\binom{n}{2}^{-1}\right\}, \tag{5.13}$$

and hence

$$2k^2 \leqslant \binom{n}{2}\left(4n\log n - n\log 4 + \frac{1}{2}\log(\pi n) + \log\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right), \tag{5.14}$$

which tells us that

$$k \leqslant (1+o(1))n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}. \tag{5.15}$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this concludes the proof. □

5.2. Proof of Theorem 1.8

The proof of our result on $D_{\mathrm{e}}(n)$, related to the number of 'edge lengths' in our representations of graphs, will be somewhat more technical.

5.2.1. Preliminary lemmas. In this section, we shall state and prove two simple inequalities related to a certain enumeration problem for an algebra of sets. Suppose we have a set X of cardinality N, and suppose we have an equivalence relation $\sim$ defined on X. We are interested in the sets that may be obtained by taking unions of equivalence classes of $\sim$. In fact, we are interested in such unions that have a given cardinality T. In what follows, we shall have $N = \binom{n}{2}$ and T quite close to $\binom{n}{2}$.

Both the statement and the proof of our first lemma are purely numerical, and hence we postpone its combinatorial interpretation (see the discussion after the proof of Lemma 5.1).

Let a pair of nonnegative integers $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2)$ such that

$$b_1 + 2b_2 = \binom{n}{2} \tag{5.16}$$

be given. For all nonnegative integers T and real $g \geqslant 0$, we let

$$c(\mathbf{b}; T, g) = c(b_1, b_2; T, g) = \sum \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2}, \tag{5.17}$$

where the sum is over all integers t_1 and t_2 such that $t_1 + 2t_2 = T$, and $t_2 \geqslant g$. Note that, in (5.17), we may ignore the terms with $t_2 > b_2$. In what follows, we always suppose that $g \leqslant t_2 \leqslant b_2$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $\omega = \omega(n) \to \infty$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *and suppose* $\omega = o(\sqrt{n/\log n})$. *For any* $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2)$ *as above, if* $g \geqslant \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}$ *and*

$$T = \binom{n}{2} - \lceil \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} \rceil, \tag{5.18}$$

then

$$c(b_1, b_2; T, g) \leqslant n^{-\omega n}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T} \tag{5.19}$$

for all large enough n.

Proof. We start by splitting the sum in (5.17) into two parts. Let us write $\sum_1$ for the sum over all integers t_1 and t_2 such that $t_1 + 2t_2 = T$, $t_2 \geqslant g$, and, moreover,

$$\binom{b_2}{t_2} \geqslant 2n^{\omega n}. \tag{5.20}$$

Let $\sum_2$ denote the sum over the remaining pairs (t_1, t_2) in (5.17). Therefore,

$$c(b_1, b_2; T, g) = \sum\nolimits_1 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2} + \sum\nolimits_2 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2}. \tag{5.21}$$

The first sum in (5.21) may be easily estimated from above, since

$$\begin{aligned} 2n^{\omega n}\sum\nolimits_1 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2} &\leqslant \sum\nolimits_1 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2}^2 \\ &\leqslant \sum\nolimits_1 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{2b_2}{2t_2} \leqslant \binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

Let us now consider the second sum in (5.21); that is, let us now consider t_1 and t_2 for which we have $\binom{b_2}{t_2} < 2n^{\omega n}$. We shall estimate the terms

$$\binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2} < 2n^{\omega n}\binom{b_1}{t_1} \tag{5.23}$$

by bounding $\binom{b_1}{t_1}$. Let us first derive some conclusions from the fact that $\binom{b_2}{t_2} < 2n^{\omega n}$. Suppose $b_2 \geqslant 2t_2$. Then

$$2^{t_2} \leqslant \left(\frac{b_2}{t_2}\right)^{t_2} \leqslant \binom{b_2}{t_2} < 2n^{\omega n}, \tag{5.24}$$

and hence $g \leqslant t_2 < 1 + \omega n \log_2 n$, which is a contradiction for large enough n. Therefore, we have $b_2 = t_2 + s$ with $0 \leqslant s < t_2$. But then

$$2^s \leqslant \left(\frac{b_2}{s}\right)^s \leqslant \binom{b_2}{s} = \binom{b_2}{t_2} < 2n^{\omega n}, \tag{5.25}$$

whence

$$s < 1 + \omega n \log_2 n. \tag{5.26}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For convenience, put $N = \binom{n}{2}$. Now observe that

$$\binom{b_1}{t_1} = \binom{N-2b_2}{T-2t_2} = \binom{N}{T}\frac{(N-T)_{2(b_2-t_2)}(T)_{2t_2}}{(N)_{2b_2}} = \binom{N}{T}\frac{(N-T)_{2s}}{(N)_{2s}}\frac{(T)_{2t_2}}{(N-2s)_{2t_2}}. \tag{5.27}$$

By (5.18), (5.26), and the fact that $\omega = o(\sqrt{n/\log n})$, the quantity in (5.27) is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leqslant \binom{N}{T}\left(\frac{N-T}{N}\right)^{2s}\left(\frac{T}{N-2s}\right)^{2t_2} \\
&\leqslant \binom{N}{T}\left(\frac{\lceil \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}\rceil}{N}\right)^{2s}\left(\frac{N-\omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}}{N-2(1+\omega n\log_2 n)}\right)^{2t_2} \\
&\leqslant \binom{N}{T}\left(\frac{1-2\omega\sqrt{(\log n)/n}}{1-(5\omega\log_2 n)/n}\right)^{2b_2} \leqslant \binom{N}{T}\left(1-\omega\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)^{2b_2},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

for all sufficiently large n. Using that $b_2 \geqslant t_2 \geqslant g \geqslant \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}$, we see that the quantity in (5.28) is

$$\leqslant \binom{N}{T}\exp(-2\omega^2 n\log n) = n^{-2\omega^2 n}\binom{N}{T}. \tag{5.29}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum\nolimits_2 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2} < 2Tn^{-2\omega^2 n+\omega n}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T} < \frac{1}{2}n^{-\omega n}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T}. \tag{5.30}$$

Putting together (5.21), (5.22), and (5.30), we get that

$$c(b_1,b_2;T,g) = \sum\nolimits_1 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2} + \sum\nolimits_2 \binom{b_1}{t_1}\binom{b_2}{t_2} \leqslant n^{-\omega n}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T}, \tag{5.31}$$

as required. □

We may interpret Lemma 5.1 as follows. Suppose we have a partition of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ into b_1 blocks of cardinality 1 and b_2 blocks of cardinality 2. Let us call a set $E \subset \binom{[n]}{2}$ compatible with this partition if E is a union of blocks of this partition. We are interested in compatible, T-element subsets E of $\binom{[n]}{2}$, with the further restriction that we now describe.

For each such set E, let us say that we pay $i-1$ pence for every block of cardinality i that we use in the decomposition of E as a union of blocks. In the function $c(\mathbf{b};T,g)$ defined in (5.17), we are only counting those sets E for which we pay at least g pence, and Lemma 5.1 tells us that not many sets E cost at least g.

In our next lemma, we consider a general partition π of $\binom{[n]}{2}$, with b_i blocks of cardinality i ($i \geqslant 1$). Lemma 5.2 tells us that the number of T-element subsets E of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ with cost $\geqslant 2g$, compatible with π, is dominated by the number of T-element subsets E of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ with cost $\geqslant g$, compatible with π', a certain partition with blocks of cardinality 1 and 2 only.

Let us describe the setup that we consider in Lemma 5.2, which is, in fact, a purely numerical result. Suppose we have a sequence $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots)$ of nonnegative integers

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such that

$$b_1 + 2b_2 + 3b_3 + \cdots = \binom{n}{2}. \tag{5.32}$$

For all nonnegative integers T and real $g \geqslant 0$, we let

$$C(\mathbf{b}; T, g) = C(b_1, b_2, \ldots; T, g) = \sum \prod_{i \geqslant 1} \binom{b_i}{t_i}, \tag{5.33}$$

where the sum is over all sequences $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \ldots)$ of nonnegative integers such that

$$t_1 + 2t_2 + 3t_3 + \cdots = T \tag{5.34}$$

and

$$t_2 + 2t_3 + 3t_4 + \cdots = \sum_{i \geqslant 2} (i-1)t_i \geqslant g. \tag{5.35}$$

Given $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots)$ as above, let b'_1 and b'_2 be given by

$$b'_1 = b_1 + b_3 + b_5 + \cdots = \sum_{k \geqslant 0} b_{2k+1} \tag{5.36}$$

and

$$b'_2 = b_2 + b_3 + 2b_4 + 2b_5 + \cdots = \sum_{k \geqslant 2} \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor b_k. \tag{5.37}$$

Note that we then have

$$b'_1 + 2b'_2 = \binom{n}{2}. \tag{5.38}$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let* $\mathbf{b}$, T, *and* g *be as above. Then*

$$C(\mathbf{b}; T, 2g) \leqslant c(b'_1, b'_2; T, g). \tag{5.39}$$

Proof. Consider a partition π of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ into b_i blocks of size i for all $i \geqslant 1$. Then π induces another partition π' of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ into b'_1 blocks of size 1 and b'_2 blocks of size 2, where b'_1 and b'_2 are as in (5.36) and (5.37). We construct π' from π by arbitrarily decomposing every block of size $2k$ into k blocks of size 2, and arbitrarily decomposing every block of size $2k+1$ into one singleton block and k blocks of size 2.

Consider E, any T-element subset of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ that is a union of blocks from π. Then, clearly, E is a T-element subset composed solely of blocks from π'. It remains to show that if E has 'cost' at least $2g$ in π, then G has cost at least g in π'.

Consider any block with $2k+1$ elements contained in E. In π, such a block would cost $2k$ pence. The corresponding blocks in π' would consist of a singleton block and k blocks of size 2, and hence cost only k pence in total. Similarly, a block of size $2k$ in π would cost $2k-1$ pence, while the corresponding k blocks of size 2 in π' would also cost k pence in total. This implies that the cost of any block in π is reduced by at most half in π'. Thus, if the total cost of E is at least $2g$ pence in π, then E would cost at least g pence in π', and the result holds. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.2.2. The proof. Having dealt with the technical lemmas in Section 5.2.1, the proof of Theorem 1.8 will be straightforward. Recall that we wish to show that for any sufficiently large n and $\omega = \omega(n)$ such that $\omega(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, there exists a graph G on n vertices such that whenever G is a $\mathscr{D}$-graph, then

$$|\mathscr{D}| \geqslant \binom{n}{2} - 3\omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} - 3.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let $\omega = \omega(n)$ as in the statement of our theorem be given. We may clearly suppose that $\omega = o(\sqrt{n/\log n})$.

Fix $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$, and consider the equivalence relation $\sim_\varphi$ defined on $\binom{[n]}{2}$. Let $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots)$, where b_i ($i \geqslant 1$) is the number of blocks, *i.e.*, equivalence classes, of $\sim_\varphi$ with cardinality i.

Let us write $\mathscr{G}(n, T)$ for the class of n-vertex graphs with T edges, up to isomorphism, where

$$T = \binom{n}{2} - \lceil \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} \rceil. \tag{5.40}$$

We have

$$|\mathscr{G}(n, T)| \geqslant \frac{1}{n!}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T}. \tag{5.41}$$

Let

$$g = \lceil \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} \rceil \tag{5.42}$$

and observe that the number of graphs in $\mathscr{G}(n, T)$ that are isomorphic to some $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ ($\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$) with

$$T - |\mathscr{D}| \geqslant 2g = 2\lceil \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} \rceil \tag{5.43}$$

is

$$\leqslant C(\mathbf{b}; T, 2g) \leqslant n^{-\omega n}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T}, \tag{5.44}$$

where the second inequality in (5.44) follows from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2.

Recall that we are considering a fixed $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$. However, as we consider all $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$, we only have

$$T(n) \leqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{en^3}{4}\right)^n \tag{5.45}$$

distinct equivalence relations (see (3.16) and Lemma 3.2). Therefore, using (5.44) and (5.45), we see that the number of graphs in $\mathscr{G}(n, T)$ that are $\mathscr{D}$-graphs with $\mathscr{D}$ satisfying (5.43) is

$$\leqslant T(n)C(\mathbf{b}; T, 2g) \leqslant (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{en^3}{4}\right)^n n^{-\omega n}\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{T}, \tag{5.46}$$

which is a great deal smaller than the lower bound given in (5.41). This shows that there is a graph G_0 in $\mathscr{G}(n, T)$ such that if G_0 is isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ for some $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$, then $T - |\mathscr{D}| < 2g$. This graph G_0 shows that

$$D_e(n) = \max_G D_e(G) > T - 2g$$
$$= T - 2\lceil \omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n}\rceil > \binom{n}{2} - 3\omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} - 3, \tag{5.47}$$

as required. □

5.3. Proof of Corollary 1.9

Corollary 1.9 follows from Theorem 1.8 and Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Corollary 1.9. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\omega = \omega(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ be given. Recall Theorem 1.8, and let n be large enough so that there is an n-vertex graph G for which we have

$$D_e(G) \geqslant \binom{n}{2} - 3\omega n^{3/2}\sqrt{\log n} - 3. \tag{5.48}$$

Let $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ be such that G is isomorphic to $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$. We may clearly suppose that

$$|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)| \geqslant |\mathscr{D}|. \tag{5.49}$$

We shall show that $\max \mathrm{im}(\varphi)$ is at least as large as the right-hand side of (1.23) if n is sufficiently large, and this will conclude the proof of Corollary 1.9.

Inequalities (5.48) and (5.49) imply that $|\mathrm{Dist}(\varphi)|$ is at least as large as the right-hand side of (5.48). Therefore (3.4) in Lemma 3.1 holds with $\varepsilon = (6 + o(1))\omega\sqrt{(\log n)/n}$, and hence that lemma implies that

$$\max \mathrm{im}(\varphi) \geqslant \left(1 - (2\sqrt{6} + o(1))\omega^{1/2}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/4}\right)n^2. \tag{5.50}$$

The result follows by taking $n \geqslant n_0(\varepsilon)$. □

6. Concluding remarks

Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 may be generalized to representations of graphs in high-dimensional Euclidean spaces. More precisely, we consider the graphs $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$, but now with $\varphi : [n] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(d, G) = \min\{|\mathscr{D}| : \mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ for which } \exists \varphi \in \left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)^{[n]}$$
$$\text{such that } G \text{ is isomorphic to } G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})\}, \tag{6.1}$$

Note that, even for $d = 2$, it becomes easier to represent graphs in the form $G(\varphi, \mathscr{D})$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$: an immediate argument shows that any tree may be drawn on the plane in such a way that all edges are straight lines of length 1, and no two non-adjacent vertices are at distance 1. Therefore, $D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(2, T) = 1$. We mention that bounded degree graphs may be

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

represented in bounded dimension: as proved in [16], if a graph G has maximum degree Δ, then $D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(2\Delta, G) = 1$.

Let us now put $D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(d, n) = \max_G D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(d, G)$, where the maximum is taken over all n-vertex graphs.

As long as $d = o(n/\log n)$, a bound similar to the one in Theorem 1.8 holds for $D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(d, n)$. Moreover, one may also prove a bound similar to the one in Theorem 1.7 for $D_e^{\mathbb{R}}(d, G)$ for almost all n-vertex graphs G. To prove these results, one may use a well-known result of Warren [21].

In addition to these higher-dimensional remarks, one may consider several problems. First, is it possible to pair the lower bounds on $D(n)$ or $D_e(n)$ with similar upper bounds? Can one give a nontrivial bound from below for $\mu(n)$?

It seems that a challenging problem is to find a nontrivial upper bound on $s_r(n)$ or, in fact, to bound the spacing numbers of any broad class of graphs from above. In [2, Remark 7.2], a problem of representing trees in a similar manner is considered, and remains open.

It was demonstrated above (via $K_{1,n}$) that determining the spacing number of even very simple graphs may be somewhat delicate. It would be of some interest to find exactly the spacing numbers of more graphs.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank John Schmitt and Brian Wagner for their help in proving Proposition 1.1. We would also like to extend our thanks to B. Bollobás, A. Kostochka, N. Linial, and O. Pikhurko for their helpful questions and remarks. We are greatly appreciative for the input of N. Wormald on the enumeration of regular graph. Finally, many thanks to the referee for several excellent suggestions.

References

[1] Alon, N. and Spencer, J. H. (1992) *The Probabilistic Method*, Wiley–Interscience, New York.
[2] Babai, L. and Sós, V. T. (1985) Sidon sets in groups and induced subgraphs of Cayley graphs. *Europ. J. Combin.* **6** 101–114.
[3] Baker, R. C., Harman, G. and Pintz, J. (2001) The difference between consecutive primes II. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **83** 532–562.
[4] Bender, E. and Canfield, E. R. (1978) The asymptotic number of labeled graphs with given degree sequences. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **24** 296–307.
[5] Bollobás, B. (2001) *Random Graphs*, 2nd edn, Vol. 73 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
[6] Bollobás, B. and Pikhurko, O. (2003) Integer sets with prescribed pairwise differences being distinct. To appear in *Europ. J. Combin.*
[7] Brègman, L. M. (1973) Certain properties of nonnegative matrices and their permanents. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **211** 27–30.
[8] Egoryčev, G. P. (1980) Reshenie problemy van-der-Vardena dlya permanentov. *Akad. Nauk SSSR Sibirsk. Otdel. Inst. Fiz., Krasnoyarsk*, Preprint IFSO-13 M.
[9] Erdős, P. and Turán, P. (1941) On a problem of Sidon in additive number theory, and on some related problems. *J. London Math. Soc.* **16** 212–215.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[10] Falikman, D. I. (1981) Proof of the van der Waerden conjecture on the permanent of a doubly stochastic matrix. *Mat. Zametki* **29** 931–938, 957.
[11] Graham, R. L., Knuth, D. E. and Patashnik, O. (1994) *Concrete Mathematics: A Foundation for Computer Science*, 2nd edn, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
[12] Halberstam, H. and Roth, K. F. (1983) *Sequences*, 2nd edn, Springer, New York.
[13] Lindström, B. (1969) An inequality for B_2-sequences. *J. Combin. Theory* **6** 211–212.
[14] Lindström, B. (1972) On B_2-sequences of vectors. *J. Number Theory* **4** 261–265.
[15] McKay, B. D. and Wormald, N. C. (1991) Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs with degrees $o(n^{1/2})$. *Combinatorica* **11** 369–382.
[16] Maehara, H. and Rödl, V. (1990) On the dimension to represent a graph by a unit distance graph. *Graphs Combin.* **6** 365–367.
[17] Pikhurko, O. (2003) Dense edge-magic graphs and thin additive bases. Submitted.
[18] Rónyai, L., Babai, L. and Ganapathy, M. K. (2001) On the number of zero-patterns of a sequence of polynomials. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **14** 717–735.
[19] Shamir, E. and Upfal, E. (1984) *Large regular factors in random graphs*. In *Convexity and Graph Theory; Jerusalem, 1981*, Vol. 87 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 271–282.
[20] Singer, J. (1938) A theorem in finite projective geometry and some applications to number theory. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **43** 377–385.
[21] Warren, H. E. (1968) Lower bounds for approximation by nonlinear manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **133** 167–178.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006637 Published online by Cambridge University Press